

March 13, 1967

using the general ticket for the election of Representatives. In 1842, to stop the practice, Congress prescribed that Representatives be elected in single-member districts (it was 1846 before all Representatives were so elected).

On the general question of representation, a select committee headed by John Quincy Adams (who had been President and Senator) reported in part:

"The representation of the people by single districts is undoubtedly the only mode by which the principle of representation, in proportion to numbers, can be carried into execution. . . .

"A more unequal mode of assembling a representation of the people in a deliberative body could not easily be contrived than that of one portion chosen by general ticket throughout the State, another portion by single districts, and a third portion by single and partly by double, treble and quadruple districts.

"This forms, in the mass, a representation not of one representative for the common standard number throughout the whole Union, but of States, and cities, and sectional divisions, in knots and clusters of population, of different dimensions and proportions. . . .

"Should the general ticket system universally prevail, it is obvious that the representation in this House will entirely change its character, from a representation of the people to a representation of States, and transform the constitutional government of the United States into a mere confederation like that which, fifty-four years ago, fell to pieces for the want of ligatures to hold it together."

"The Commission's recommendation to provide for the election of the President and Vice President by direct nationwide popular vote would eliminate the federal-national element of the President's constituency. In place of the federal-national constituency would be substituted an eccentric mathematical constituency of voters representing none but themselves and subjected to the whims of weather and the convenience of the polling place; the political center of gravity would shift about as varying ideological forces, now confined by State boundaries, organized themselves nationwide; and the present intra-state election of Electors under State laws would give way to an inter-state election of the President under national laws enacted by Congress. The Commission recommends the latter.

The Commission's requirement that a candidate must receive at least 40 percent of the popular vote would cut asunder the taproot of the two-party system which is majority requirement in the Electoral College to elect a President, and would bless, Constitutionally, a President opposed by a large majority of the voters.

The recommendation that the places and manner of holding the Presidential election and the inclusion of names on the ballot should be prescribed in each State by the Legislature thereof, with the provision that Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, would violate the principle of separation of powers. Congress now has no authority whatever over this subject. The proposal would compel Congress to regulate party conventions for Presidential nominations and every detail of the election.

"The Commission calls the Electoral College system of electing a President 'archaic, undemocratic, complex, ambiguous, indirect, and dangerous.' If the system is archaic then so is the Constitution. If the system is undemocratic, whatever that means here, it is certainly unrepresentative—but only because its representative members are elected on a statewide general ticket. If it is ambiguous the Commission should explain. Certainly the system is indirect—as it was

designed to be—and as it must be if the separated Legislative and Executive powers are to be founded on constituencies most closely resembling each other. If the present system is dangerous, as the Commission argues, then the danger lies in the states' general-ticket system and not within the Constitution.

The present evil distortion between the constituencies of the Executive and Legislative Powers is not through Constitutional requirement but was created a long time ago, by the State Legislatures in a misuse of their authority, under the whip of partisan politics. This does not furnish good reason to embed within the Constitution an equally evil distortion between the constituencies of the President and Congress. The result would be a political monstrosity, with Congress based on a federal union of States—and the Executive, an elected "king" of a unitary government.

The Electoral College is the most misunderstood of American political institutions. Almost every man has his own set of mistaken ideas on the subject, and the Commission's report—in what it said and in what it didn't say—is conclusive evidence that this is true.

ACTIVITIES OF THE CIA

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], in his recent report to citizens of Oregon, states his views about the activities of the CIA as related to the National Student Association and other domestic groups. In his report, Senator MORSE discusses both whether there was a need for secrecy and the effects of it on a democratic society. I ask unanimous consent that the section of his report dealing with the CIA be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE CIA: HAS IT PENETRATED AMERICAN SOCIETY MORE THAN IT HAS PENETRATED COMMUNIST SOCIETIES?

A young man from Seaside, Oregon, named Phil Sherburne, is a University of Oregon graduate who was president of the National Student Association in 1965-66. His effort to sever NSA dependence on the Central Intelligence Agency for much of its budget has produced another round in the old argument of whether ends justify means. In recent weeks, every day has brought new stories of unions, student groups, academic and literary associations, even church organizations, receiving secret CIA money through dummy foundations.

The defense of secrecy in financing these activities is a curious one. It holds that the decision to finance these "fronts" was made in the period of 1952 to 1954, an era dominated by McCarthyism. It contends that in many contests around the world where Communists were in competition with non-Communists, it would have been impossible to persuade Congress to appropriate funds to send our representatives abroad at public expense. So in the interest of assuring that liberals, even leftist Americans, who could better compete with Communists than could conservatives, would be on hand at international meetings, CIA slipped them the money.

The odd thing about this official defense, however, is that long after the demise of McCarthy, the programs not only continued, but were expanded. In these years, 70 and 80% of the NSA budget, which included extensive civil rights activities in this country, came from CIA. A wildly mismanaged bookstore venture by University of Chicago students lost \$140,000, a tab picked up by CIA.

We also have learned that the U.S. Information Agency has long had a secret program of causing books to be written and published in the United States. Part of this subsidy also came from CIA, all unknown to the buyer and reader.

I have been appalled and astonished that in the latter days of the Eisenhower Administration, and the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations, conspiratorial thinking at the highest level dominated these decisions. It is difficult to understand why Congress could not have been asked openly to provide money to finance the international convention of the National Education Association; to pay U.S. unions to train journalists, and to teach unionists in Latin America, Africa, and Asia how to organize workers and how to bargain with employers.

But secrecy begat easy money, and more easy money begat more secrecy. The necessity to explain the purpose, to educate public opinion, and to obtain permission was circumvented by funding these things secretly. Conservative members of Congress who say now they knew about these CIA activities and approved of them, did not have to explain to their constituents what they were supporting, and why.

This is all rationalized on the ground of "intelligence-gathering." But little of it had to do with gathering information. These were operational programs, not unlike some we finance openly through foreign aid. Some, like American Friends of the Middle East, took the form of propaganda at home more than propaganda abroad.

Senator Yarborough of Texas has introduced an amendment to the International Education Act, authorizing the Office of Education to finance openly certain student and academic activities abroad. I support it. I am anxious that we put an end to the secrecy and hypocrisy of CIA sponsorship of such programs. Likewise, I believe the international activities of unions should be financed through the Department of Labor, or AID or the State Department, and the public should know about it. CIA funding has made a farce of our claim that unlike Communists, Americans who represent private U.S. organizations abroad act as free agents and not as minions of their government. We should stop making false claims, and compete with Communism on our own ground of being what we claim to be. We should not fall victim to lame excuses about "fighting fire with fire," when water is still the best defense against fire.

If the forms of democracy are too inconvenient, too exacting, for us to respect, who else in the world will respect them? We require candidates for office to disclose their campaign funds; we punish elected officeholders for misuse of public money; we enact federal laws requiring citizens to disclose more and more of their business practices in labeling, packaging, and interest rates. But while the federal government requires more forthrightness from the American people, it retreats further into the world of deception and stealth in its own operation. This scandal has shown us what a long way we have travelled down the road to a police state.

AMERICA'S CLEAR AND PRESENT DANGER

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the President has announced that Soviet Premier Kosygin has agreed to discuss the possibility of a mutual disarmament program, one in which the United States would be expected to refrain from establishing an anti-ballistic-missile system. In light of the incontestable fact that the U.S.S.R. has already deployed an extensive ABM system around its principal